

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 07 2006**

Attorney Docket No. 356-014-USP

**REMARKS**

This Response is being submitted in response to the Office action mailed on June 20, 2006 and is believed to be fully responsive thereto. Claims 1-81 are pending in the application, of which claims 31-81 have previously been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended in this Response. In the Office action, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-30 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over copending United States patent application number 10/817,701. The Examiner has not asserted any other rejections and the provisional rejection is the only remaining rejection in the present application.

As stated in the MPEP, where the provisional obvious-type double patenting rejection can be withdrawn in a base application where the provisional obvious-type double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in that application. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 804(I)B(1). Here the Examiner has not made the required determination of whether the present '590 application or the '701 application is the base application since both applications were filed on the same day. *See id.* The present '590 application is directed to a process for manufacturing an electrode for an energy storage device. The '701 application is directed to a process for manufacturing an electrode for an electro-chemical device, however, which is only one possible type of energy storage device. Thus, the base application is the present '590. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the provisional rejection of claims 1-30 on the basis that the provisional rejection is the only remaining rejection of the claims in the base application, and to allow claims 1-30.

The Examiner has also not responded to the Applicant's arguments made in the previous Amendment and Response filed on March 27, 2006. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims are now allowable over the prior art of record.

This Response is being filed within three months of the non-final Office action dated June 20, 2006. Accordingly, Applicant believes that no fees are due or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 accordingly.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 07 2006

Attorney Docket No. 356-014-USP


**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-30 are pending, and the Applicant believes each claim is currently in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference could expedite the prosecution of the application or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: September 7, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Osborne, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,796  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 59542

HENSLEY KIM & EDGINGTON, LLC  
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050  
Denver, Colorado 80264  
Tel: 720-377-0770  
Fax: 720-377-0777